Reply to Office Action of February 26, 2008

## **Remarks**

Claims 1-25 were pending prior to this response; claims 21-25 were withdrawn. By this paper, Applicant cancels withdrawn claims 21-25. But Applicant reserves the right to submit canceled claims 21-25 in a divisional patent application. Applicant also amends claims 2-20, cancels claim 1, and adds claim 26. So claims 2-20 and 26 are now pending.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. §112 paragraph 2 as indefinite. In particular, the Examiner contended that limitations (b) and (c) in claim 1 were unclear. The rejection to claim 1 is now moot because claim 1 is canceled. Applicant believes that new claim 26 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. §112(2).

The Examiner did not provide a reason for rejecting claims 2-19. So Applicant presumes that the Examiner rejected claims 2-19 simply because of their dependency from claim 1. Claims 2-19 now depend from claim 26, so Applicant requests the Examiner to withdraw the \$112(2) rejection from claims 2-19.

Applicant noticed and corrected several informalities in claims 2-20 to present these claims in a more clear format.

Atty Dkt No. PIP 0113 PUSA

S/N: 10/534,311 Reply to Office Action of February 26, 2008

Please charge any fees or credit any overpayments resulting from the filing of this paper to Deposit Account No. 02-3978.

Respectfully submitted,

## **RAJEEV PRASAD GUPTA**

By /Hersh H. Mehta/
Hersh H. Mehta
Reg. No. 62,336
Agent for Applicant

Date: June 26, 2008

## **BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.**

1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor Southfield, MI 48075-1238

Phone: 248-358-4400 Fax: 248-358-3351